

DISMISSAL OF SECRET SERVICE DIRECTOR
RANDOLPH ALLES

Madam President, on the Secret Service Director's dismissal, this brings me to my final point.

Just a few hours ago, the White House confirmed that it has now also asked that Secret Service Director Randolph Alles step aside. His departure comes in the midst of recent reports about potentially serious security vulnerabilities surrounding President Trump, particularly at Mar-a-Lago. That is why the outgoing Secret Service Director must testify before Congress as soon as possible about the potential security vulnerabilities at Mar-a-Lago, vulnerabilities that involve a Chinese national arrested with malware on her person and other threats.

The public and Congress need to know the extent to which adversarial governments like China are attempting to infiltrate and conduct electronic surveillance on classified conversations or other information regarding national security at President Trump's properties. The President and the White House staff may like to treat hiring and firing in the administration as some kind of reality TV show or parlor game, but to the American people, this has real-life consequences.

This is about national security, security at our airports, responding to national disasters, including our efforts to fight international cargo carrying drugs like fentanyl. That is why it is urgent to get to the bottom of this and why the outgoing Secret Service Director must testify as soon as possible.

Now, all three of these comments—what is happening in Puerto Rico, what is happening with the Department of Homeland Security, and now the Secret Service—indicate just the chaos that seems to be overwhelming this administration.

President Trump's policies, if he has them, switch from day to day. He is erratic. He seems to get emotional. He pushes out whatever is on his mind that day no matter its consequences, and this country is floundering. There is a lot of rhetoric and not much else.

All these people leaving in very important positions—the President undercutting them, not calling them into the office and having a discussion, but tweeting and ranting. I have never seen America governed like this—never.

And I don't care what your political affiliation is. I don't care if you are a liberal, moderate, or conservative. What is happening in this White House—as it fails to lead this country and does seem something like a TV reality show—is hurting us. It is hurting us and hurting us badly, and I hope we can get some bipartisan efforts to do things about this and to speak up about it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The senior Senator from Iowa.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE
AGREEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for 1 minute before I speak about what I came for a longer period of time to the floor to speak about, I want to address a trade issue. Congress needs to pass the United States-Mexico-Canada agreement this year to give farmers and businesses the certainty that they need and the certainty they deserve.

The past year has brought rising costs, lost markets, and uncertainty for the farmers and businesses. We need to focus on creating opportunities instead of erecting barriers. I would like to see a resolution with Canada and Mexico on steel and aluminum tariffs, one that would acknowledge that we need our allies to help us deal with the source of the overcapacity problems, and that source of the problem is China.

I urge President Trump to lift the 232 tariffs so that we can forge ahead with the U.S.-Mexico-Canada agreement and eliminate the uncertainty that is present in the American market.

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. President, now for the main purpose of my coming to the floor: After years of hearing Democrats falsely proclaim that the Trump campaign colluded with Russia, Special Counsel Mueller found no collusion existed.

The fact that there was no collusion is a very positive development, not just for this administration, but for the entire country. However, it does seem that the real collusion occurred with Democrats, and I will explain.

It was the Clinton campaign and Democratic National Committee that hired Fusion GPS to do opposition research against Candidate Trump. Fusion GPS then hired Christopher Steele, a former British intelligence officer, to compile the Steele dossier that reportedly used Russian Government sources for information.

You see, it was the Clinton campaign and the Democratic National Committee that funded the document that largely created the collusion narrative, a narrative that has been deemed false, and of course, that is the irony here.

The Democrats paid for a document created by a foreign national with reported Russian Government sources, not Trump. President Trump did not do that. The Democrats did. But apparently, it is not over yet, or so the Democrats tell us every day. Their next step is to subpoena the entire Mueller report.

Well, I agree that Congress and the public should see that information, and it sounds to me like President Trump agrees as well. The Attorney General has already said, on multiple occasions, that he is going to release as much information as the law allows and as soon as he can, and it looks like Congress—and likely the public—will get the Mueller report this month of April sometime.

But Democrats have requested more than just the report. They have asked

the Justice Department to also produce the Mueller report's underlying evidence, including all intelligence-related information.

I agree with the need to see as much information as possible. In fact, I have cosponsored a bipartisan bill that would do just that, but the Democrats' fury over Mueller's findings and their inconsistent positions makes me think all of this is more about politics than principle.

After all, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee opposed the release of this type of information in the 1990s. To guard against that political gamesmanship, there is only one legitimate way to do this: Let's see all the documents.

But by all—I don't mean just those related to the Mueller investigation—we should see every piece of evidence, including evidence connected to how the Russia investigation started.

Now that should be a very easy ask, and do you know why? I have already requested that information. For example, I have asked documents related to Steele, his dossier, and campaign-related FISA applications.

These documents relate to actions taken by James Comey, Peter Strzok, and Bruce Ohr and are critical to Congress fully understanding the creation of the Russia investigation. If Congress is going to review the Mueller report and all underlying information, it should be able to review information relating to how the Russia investigation started.

So will the Democrats join me in that effort and support my request?

Further, to be consistent, we shouldn't stop at the Russia investigation. The Democrats want all the Mueller information, but seem to be turning a blind eye to other investigations where Congress and the public have yet to see every bit of information that is out there.

Again, that leads me to believe their request for Mueller-related documents is a political ploy. Take, for example, the Clinton investigation. Will Democrats ask the Justice Department for all the underlying information relating to the Hillary Clinton investigation?

As I have written about publicly before, the Justice Department inspector general produced to Congress a highly classified document relating to the Clinton investigation. That document makes clear the Justice Department and the FBI still ought to produce information to Congress and answer more questions.

For example, the unclassified version of the inspector general's report provides important context about the classified report, and I have a long quote here:

The FBI had considered obtaining permission from the Department to review certain classified materials that may have included information potentially relevant to the Midyear investigation. Although the Midyear team drafted a memorandum to the Deputy Attorney General in late May 2016 stating that review of the highly classified material

was necessary to complete the investigation and requesting permission to access them, the FBI never sent this request to the Department.

So the inspector general found four important things, according to the unclassified report. No. 1, the FBI apparently had highly classified information potentially relevant to the Clinton investigation in its possession. Two, the FBI drafted a memo to get access to the information. Three, that memo said review of the information was necessary to complete the investigation. And then, four, ironically, that memo was never sent.

Years later, when the inspector general interviewed the FBI agents, they said they didn't seek access to the information because they didn't think it would materially impact the conclusion. Now, how could they conclude that point if they never got access to the information?

In May of 2016, the memo was necessary to complete the investigation, and then years later, somehow, it wasn't. That is materially inconsistent and obviously makes no sense. Moreover, look at the month the memo was drafted: May 2016.

That is the same month that James Comey began writing his statement exonerating Hillary Clinton, which was months before the FBI interviewed her. Did Comey's actions have a trickle-down effect on his subordinates, causing him to kill the memo and pull their punches? It seems to me that we ought to find out.

To my colleagues, it sounds like the FBI left a potential mountain of evidence unreviewed. How can you complete an investigation without reviewing all the evidence relative to the investigation? The American people have every right to question how this investigation was handled, and they deserve answers.

Assuming President Trump has read the classified inspector general report, he would understand the importance of the Justice Department responding to my inquiries about it. I have written to the Justice Department and other agencies seeking those answers.

I would like to know, since the Democrats want to investigate everything dealing with collusion and the Mueller report, would they join me in that request?

I want to give you another example: Uranium One. I have been pushing for years for more answers about the transaction that allowed the Russian Government to acquire U.S. uranium assets.

I have received classified and unclassified briefings about it from multiple Agencies, and I have identified some FBI intelligence reports that may shed more light on the transaction.

Just last week, my staff were told that the Attorney General has refused to provide access to those documents. Well, if the Democrats demand intelligence-related information from the Justice Department regarding the

Mueller report, there is no reason they shouldn't do the same for Uranium One. And if the Justice Department provides that information about the Mueller report, well, then, there is no reason they should hold the Uranium One material.

It kind of gets down to this point: If the Democrats want to be consistent, they will have to treat Clinton, Uranium One, and Russia-related investigations the same. Anything less than that reeks of political gamesmanship and sets a clear double standard, and that double standard also extends to the position the Democrats have taken with respect to obstruction.

We know Mueller did not conclude that the President committed a crime, and neither did the Attorney General. Still, Democrats want to make the case that Trump obstructed justice, even though the Justice Department said otherwise.

With no evidence, the Democrats have accused the Attorney General of bias, but Mr. Barr evaluated this matter in close consultation with Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein—the person who appointed Mueller in the first place.

The Democrats are looking for absolutely anything they can to make a case when there is no case. But these same Democrats and the Obama Justice Department didn't bat an eye when Clinton's associates deleted records subject to congressional subpoena and preservation orders.

In March of 2015, Secretary Clinton's attorneys had a conference call with Paul Combetta, the man who helped manage Clinton's nongovernment server. After that call, he deleted Clinton's emails with BleachBit, a software program designed to prevent forensic recovery.

I have seen no evidence that anyone has even speculated that the President ever did that or instructed anyone to go that far. What also troubles me about one aspect of the Clinton investigation is that the FBI agreed to limit the scope of review to her time as Secretary of State. That eliminated potentially highly relevant emails before and after her tenure that could have shed light on why she operated a nongovernment server. It also eliminated emails around the time of that conference call that could have shown exactly what was intended in deleting those emails.

Why did the DOJ and FBI pull their punches? Mueller sure didn't pull his punches. He extended his scope of investigation well beyond allegations of collusion, which turned out to be false.

Lastly, the FBI agreed to destroy records and laptops of Clinton's associates after reviewing them. That happens to be an astonishing agreement in light of the fact that those records could have been relevant to ongoing congressional inquiries that the FBI knew about.

Where were the Democrats when all of that stuff happened? Where was

their outrage at the potential obstruction of justice and obstruction of congressional oversight? It seems to me that if the Democrats want to be consistent, they will have to address what was done—and what was totally ignored—in the Clinton investigation.

Let's also not forget about the prosecutorial double standard. Secretary Clinton and her associates mishandled highly classified information. The law makes "grossly negligent" mishandling of classified information a criminal offense. Comey did not recommend prosecution because it was not historically done under the law unless "intent" was present. So not only did he and the Justice Department read "intent" into the statute, they made a judgment call based upon how many times someone had been charged under the law.

The same thing could be said of the Foreign Agents Registration Act and lying to Congress. Each has had minimal prosecutions.

Between 1966 and 2015, the Justice Department brought only seven criminal Foreign Agents Registration Act cases. One resulted in a conviction, two pled guilty, and the rest pled to other charges or they were dismissed. All of that changed with Mueller. So we have a double standard again.

Unlike Comey, Mueller didn't seem to think historical precedent was all that important. Some have said that Mueller has made FARA a law to pay attention to—the same with 18 U.S.C. 1001, which covers lying to Federal agents and Congress.

Recently, the Justice Department has said that it is transitioning "from treating FARA as an administrative obligation and regulatory obligation to one that is increasingly an enforcement priority." Well, it may be about time that the laws are enforced, and that is a very good and necessary shift.

I have engaged in FARA oversight since April 2015. I also held a FARA oversight hearing in July 2017 and introduced the Disclosing Foreign Influence Act to shore up that law of the 1930s. I want to see FARA properly enforced, and I am glad that the Justice Department suddenly seems to care whether somebody lied to Congress. I want to see equal enforcement, not just with FARA but with all laws.

I have said many times before that the law must be applied equally without regard to power, party, or privilege. That approach prevents inconsistent application and avoids double standards. So when the Democrats ask for material relating to the Russian investigation, I say: Fine, let's do it. However, that means they ought to be consistent with other investigations, and the Justice Department has to be as well. Anything less is a double standard.

I will tell you right now, the Democrats' obsession with bringing Trump down is nothing but a double standard if they are going to ignore other investigations of national importance. If

you want to be taken seriously in this country, you have to be consistent.

My attitude and my approach is straightforward and nonpartisan. Let's see it all: Clinton, Uranium One, Russia—all of it. Let it hang out. Sunshine is the best disinfectant.

To my colleagues in the Democratic Party: Are you afraid to be consistent? Are you afraid of what might be found? Let's work to make sure the American people have as much information as possible about all of these investigations. After all, the taxpayers are paying for the work. And don't forget that the American taxpayers ought to have some consideration when their money is spent to make sure that equality and enforcement of the law is the same for all.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

You may proceed.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF JEREIMA "JERI" BUSTAMANTE ON THE 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF HER PASSING

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of one of Florida's brightest lights—a light that was extinguished far too soon.

One year ago today, we lost Jeri Bustamante in a tragic accident. She was my press secretary, but she was so much more. She was my Spanish tutor. She was my travel partner. She was so kind to everyone that you couldn't help but love her.

Everyone thought Jeri was their best friend because she was so loving to everyone. She brightened every room that she walked into and made everyone around her better. There is not much that brings the Florida political world together, but Republicans, Democrats, and even her friends in the press loved and respected Jeri.

She lived the American dream. As a small child, Jeri moved from Panama to the United States with her family, speaking only Spanish. She grew up in Miami, where she attended Miami Beach High, Miami-Dade Community College, and Florida International University.

She had a passion for communications. She started out at a local Miami TV station and eventually worked for the Miami-Dade property appraiser under Carlos Lopez-Cantera, who became my Lieutenant Governor.

She joined my reelection campaign for Governor in 2014, and she was with me for 4 years. She was determined. She was courageous. She had big goals. She wanted to be the Press Secretary for the President of the United States,

and I have no doubt she would have been. That is the kind of person she was. She never stopped working to meet her goals in life, but she always did it with a smile, with a joke, and with a kind word.

In Jeri's memory, my wife Ann and I established the Jeri Bustamante Memorial Scholarship to support a graduate of Miami Beach Senior High School, who, like Jeri, is trying to become the first in their family to go to college.

Today Senator MARCO RUBIO and I are introducing a resolution to honor Jeri's memory. We will never forget her, and we will never forget the ways she made all of us better.

Now I would like to honor Jeri in the best way I know how, speaking the Spanish she taught me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in Spanish. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I have provided a translation to the Senate for the RECORD.

(English translation of statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Jeri lived the American dream. She was determined. She was brave. She had great goals. She wanted to be the Press Secretary of the President of the United States. I have no doubt that she would have achieved it. That is the kind of person she was. She never stopped struggling to fulfill her goals in life and always did so with a smile, a joke, and a kind word.

Senator RUBIO and I today present a resolution to honor Jeri's memory. We will never forget her.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 147, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 147) honoring the memory of Jereima "Jeri" Bustamante on the 1-year anniversary of her passing.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 147) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

I yield the floor.

COLORADO RIVER DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLAN AUTHORIZATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. President, the Colorado River is the lifeblood of the Southwestern United States. The river provides drinking water to 40 million Americans, irrigation to 5.5 million acres of farmland, and more than 4,000 megawatts of carbon-free hydropower to communities across the West in seven States.

Unfortunately, the last 19 years have been the Colorado Basin's driest on record. This long and intense drought has left the combined water stored behind Lake Powell and Lake Mead near critically low levels, putting the water supply for some of the Nation's largest cities in danger.

The Colorado River Drought Contingency Plan—otherwise known as the DCP—was negotiated among the seven Colorado River Basin States to respond to this prolonged drought. It is designed to protect Lakes Mead and Powell from reaching certain critical water elevations that would trigger severe water supply and hydropower impacts, including the risk of reaching crisis levels where operational control of the Colorado River system would be lost.

These States put in a lot of hard work and sacrifice for the good of all who rely on the river. By doing this, they avoided having the Department of Interior directing draconian measures and cuts from the Federal Government. But the plan must be codified in law. It literally takes an act of Congress to approve the DCP, and it is urgent. That is why I am on the floor today.

I am proud of the bipartisan nature of this legislation. As the Water and Power Subcommittee chair, I am leading this legislation with my Democratic ranking member from Nevada, Senator CORTEZ MASTO. We have all 14 Senators from all 7 States—8 Democrats and 6 Republicans spanning a wide ideological spectrum—as original cosponsors. This bill is about an impending water crisis impacting Western States like Arizona. The effort to get this bill to this point is an example of bipartisanship that Arizonans and Americans are calling for. This is about the livelihood and the safety of 40 million Americans.

The Colorado River DCP Authorization Act puts sound water policy over partisan politics. People thought that never happened in Washington, DC. Today, they should be celebrating about this bill. I ask all my colleagues to join the 14 bipartisan Senators from the Colorado River Basin and support this bill.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1057. I further ask consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the